Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0849GA-1 for Ware County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicants vision for this grant is clearly anchored to the extensive and successful reforms implemented during the past 6 years. The applicant provided a comprehensive review of these system wide reforms and how the new vision relates and builds upon them. The present vision however, lacks cohesiveness. It would appear the applicant has listed a variety of "wishes" without attention to how these wishes will support an overall reform vision for the district. This section earned a medium rating because of the lack of cohesiveness and significance.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All of the students and all of the schools district-wide will participate in and benefit from this grant. The district made a conscious decision to implement the reforms district wide so all schools, students, grade bands, subgroups and subject areas will be included. In the past, their reform efforts have raised the bar for all. They intend to continue in this direction. A table was included listing all schools and including number of teachers, students, percentages in the subgroup categories. This section received full points.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant chose to not address this section (A)(3) stating that because their plan is district-wide and all students and schools will participate, the district has no need for a plan to scale up for district-wide change. They state "This criterion does not apply."

Full points were awarded to this section because the applicant provided a logical explanation to how they were addressing the components of this section and the third required element (3) how it will help the applicant reach its outcome goals was addressed in the early sections.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided the required criteria a through d, but did not provide introductory narrative explaining how the vision would result in improved student learning and performance as well as increased equity across subgroups.

The applicant first summarized all of the district and state assessments the district currently administers. The applicant then selected End of Course Assessments for the 9th grade and Criterion Referenced Competency Tests in the core areas of Reading, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies as their performance measures for the first criteria in this section. It is unclear why these assessments were selected.

The applicant appears to have misunderstood the purpose of the "subgroup" category in the (A)(4) table. Instead of indicating the performance of their subgroups on their selected measures, they mistakenly used that column to record content areas to be tested. Additionally, they did not indicate what grade levels the Criterion Referenced tests would be administered to. Again, there was no narrative provided to explain why these measures were selected.

The applicant provided goals for each of the criteria included in this section, a through d.

Recruiting students and particularly minority students in the middle school to participate in Honors and Advanced Placement

classes at the high school is the goal they have set to decrease the achievement gap.

No narrative was provided to explain how the district planned to impact the graduation rates though ambitious and achievable targets.

College enrollment data will be available sometime in the future due to a combined effort from the Georgia State Department of Education and the Georgia Governor's Office of Student Achievement to build a data system to link longitudinal data across the states entire P-20 system. Limited data was shared on this criteria.

Because as cited above limited narrative was provided, the application received a medium score.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant details in tables the impressive strides made over the past 6 years in all subgroups and over all student performance and graduation rates. Achievement gaps saw significant closure in all subgroups during this time. The two lowest performing schools, not having attained AYP for three successive years, were just this year recognized as High Progress schools. By every metric, Ware schools are seeing significant student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and revitalizing persistently low achieving schools.

Student performance data is made available to students and parents online through Infinite Campus, and for those parents without internet access, availability is provided on the school campuses. The applicant states that student performance data is made available to students, educators and parents but does not specifically address how educators have access. The Balanced Scorecard Comprehensive Needs Assessments are posted on school and or district websites, but the applicant does not indicate what this information is.

The applicant does not address college enrollment rates in this section. Limited college enrollment rates were provided on a table in section (A)(4)(d).

Because of the omission of educator access to performance assessments and not addressing the college enrollment rates, this section we reduced by two points.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant addressed all the criteria required in this section and thus received full points. Criteria in a through d is posted annually at the Georgia Department of Education's website.The data base is searchable by school, system, program and funding source. Non-personnel expenditures are also posted here. Open Georgia is another website that contains details available to the public on how Georgia schools spend their tax dollars. At the district level, the district posts monthly Revenue and Expense Statements and balance sheets. These and other budget reports are posted on the district website, such as the full annual audits.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Ware District has been in the forefront of state reform implementation such as adopting, training and applying the RTI model locally while the state was still defining the concept. The district even received recognition from the state for their implementation of RTI. The district is known for it's innovations in education and technology. Limited evidence was provided to assure autonomy from both the state and local levels. The scoring of this section reflects a medium range.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Results from a principal, teacher, staff survey to gage support were provided as evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement. An Appendix includes the survey results including the actual feedback collected (but the letter designation for

the Appendix was missing in the narrative). The narrative did not indicate what percentage of the total teacher population supported the proposal.

The narrative did not include who was involved in the actual proposal development. There was no mention of consulting with other stakeholders such as students and parents in the development of the application.

Letters of support were included at the end of the grant application though as indicated above, the specific Appendices were not identified in the narrative. It appears the applicant submitted the proposal without completing this last step. Letters of support were received from a variety of local and state organizations and businesses: the Chairman of the Ware County Commission, professors and university representatives, the Lieutenant Governor of Georgia, the Mayor of Waycross, and the Executive Director of the Regional Educational Services Agency. The letters of support were not representative of a broad base of stakeholders. There was no support from parents, parent organizations, or student organizations. Additionally, there was no state level endorsement.

The district just passed a one percent Local Option Tax for increased technology, an indication of the degree of stakeholder support the district enjoys. Nevertheless, the applicant minimally addressed the criteria in this section and as such received a low medium score.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**4**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Appendix included the logic behind the Ware's reform proposal (and again none of the Appendices were identified in the narrative or sequenced in the Appendices). The applicant provided a complicated flow chart with disparate goals rather than the requested logic model. There were distinct but unconnected activities listed under each category, though the applicant did include measurable metrics aligned with each activity.

The applicant included a detailed table outlining the extensive needs assessment they will embark upon to determine needs and gaps from which to develop a high quality plan. This has not been conducted at the time of the writing of this proposal and so the plan put forth by the applicant in this grant may not accurately reflect the district needs. this section was scored in the high range giving the applicant the benefit of the doubt for the incomplete information and the difficult to understand refrom flow chart.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**4**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section (C)(1) only minimally addresses the criteria requested and as such was awarded a low score.

The applicant has not built the case that this is a high quality plan. The applicant has included a list of discreet and somewhat unrelated activities that will be accomplished in their plan to address Learning but these do not equate to a cohesive plan.

The applicant makes a number of statements that are not grounded in evidence or detail.

The personal value of earning a high school diploma and pursing post secondary education will continue to be demonstrated to students and their families as an attainable goal. how this will be accomplished is not specified.

Innovative teaching and learning styles will prepare students for college and careers by fostering skills such as collaboration, critical thinking, etc. No detail is provided to indicate how this will occur, how teachers will change their teaching to result in this.

The "bring your own device" is the applicants' stated strategy for addressing the needs of all students, though again, this is not described.

The applicant cites D2D, Direct to Discovery, a high definition video conferencing technology that will provide deep learning

experiences for students and introduce them to college and career skills. It does not clearly link or document how video conferencing (which can be engaging) will do the things they purport-provide deep learning experiences and introduce college and career skills.

The introduction of an entrepreneurship training curriculum will answer how Ware will guide students to college and career pathways. This may indeed be true, but there is no explanation of what this curriculum is and how it will accomplish this. It appears that it is part of the professional technical courses, so not all students would be enrolled in these.

The district will begin preparing students for graduation in preschool though no specifics are provided.

Ware proposes that parents will become more familiar with their student's learning and curriculum by participating in the Parent University, the 24/7 homework help line and the Teachers as Advisors initiative. Again, there is no detail on how these will enable parents to understand the college and career skills their children need to learn.

The plan does address accommodations for high needs students to ensure they are on track for graduation and college through the use of the RTI framework. The applicant briefly describes RTI. The use of RTI does not necessarily translate to using high quality strategies for high needs students.

The applicant indicates that a number of strategies are in place to ensure personalization of learning for students. All students are taught in Standards Based classrooms using Learning Focused Strategies. All students participate in Universal Screenings. Flexible grouping is used to differentiate instruction. Advanced placement courses are available for students needing above grade level challenges.

A variety of high quality instructional approaches have not been described. The applicant lists ongoing and regular feedback to students through Infinite Campus, a student information system.

Information technology assistants will be provided by hiring two information technology specialists. These positions will help teachers in using the new technologies. Student teachers will use technology for homework assistance. And parents will learn technology through the Parent University.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The criteria in this section were minimally addressed by the applicant. Statements of fact were made without including supporting evidence, I.E. Ware teachers will use data collection and frequent feedback...as needed for continuous improvement. There was no indication of what infrastructure is in place to allow this to happen and how frequent feedback would be provided. (a)

The applicant states that Ware's teachers have access to and know how to use tools, data and resources to accelerate students progress. This statement is not backed up with any evidence of the data, tools and resources the teachers are using. (b)

The applicant states that the teacher evaluation system under development will provide valuable information that will help school leaders and leadership teams assess and improve individual and collective educator effectiveness. Again, there is no specific examples describing how the new evaluation system will indeed facilitate these kinds of improvements.

There is no plan to connect students with highly effective teachers, only that as the teacher and administrator evaluation template improve, Ware will adopt a plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from these top teachers. (d)

The applicant includes the Direct to Teaching as an example of how Ware's reform proposal will increase teacher's capacity to support student achievement through their own professional growth. The project gets motivated teachers opportunities to study with STEM professors online and bring back what they learn into their classrooms through distance learning.(b)

The criteria in this section were minimally addressed by the applicant. There were a number of statements that were not verified with specific examples. This section was scored in the low range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant minimally addressed the criteria in this section and as such was rated in the low range.

A, b, d, and e are not addressed by the applicant in this section.

The organizational chart the applicant refers to in the Appendices was not located.

A superintendent's cabinet, leadership teams and administrative councils are referred to as frameworks for local decision making and problem solving. Although these teams are identified, there is no description of how these leadership teams actually provide support and services to the district schools. The narrative does not provide any description of how school leadership teams function or what kinds of decisions they have autonomy over.

The applicant states that credit is earned by demonstrated mastery in Ware Schools. An example is provided of this. "The Ware District is waiting for approval of a waiver for a student who passed an end of course exam without taking the course. This waiver will enable the student to take a preferred course."

Remedial support is provided to students who have not reached mastery and the are then re-tested to ensure mastery.

The district has adopted an inclusion policy and raised their expectations for special needs students which is indeed noteworthy. Overall, there were too many omissions in this section to score it above a minimal range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides acceptable examples of how they plan to increase their district infrastructure to better support student and parent access to and use of technology in and out of school.

"Bring your own devices" and the access to the D2D teleconferencing field trips are cited as examples of how Ware District supports equitable learning opportunities for students as required in (a).

The applicant is pursuing the infrastructure needed to provide county wide internet access as required in (c).

The hiring of two additional technology staff for the purpose of assisting students and staff with technology needs as well as providing technology classes to parents through the Parent University are also cited as how parents and other stakeholders have access to technology supports as required in (b) and (c).

Infinite Campus is an interactive student information system that is seeing increasing usage in the district. The grant will enable the newly hired technology staff to provide parents instruction on how to use Infinite Campus as required in (b).

Ware has begun using inter-operable data systems and provided an example of one from the Human Resources and Finance Departments as required in (d).

The applicant provided examples of how their proposal meets the requirements of this section.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant will hire staff to fulfill the requirements in this section. Ware District will create a Continuous Improvement Center staffed by an independent research organization to provide a continuous improvement process. This team will coordinate stakeholder involvement, capacity building, co-interpret data, etc. The program logic model is referred to in the appendices. The applicant includes a table outlining the continuous improvement performance measures, the type of data collected, methods for collecting data, and analysis strategies and the frequency with which the data will be collected.

The measures included in the table are specific but aren't necessarily connected to rigorous project goals. For example, to measure whether learning environments are aligned to college and career ready standards, documents will be analyzed and tracked. This however does not fully address the intent of this section which is to ensure the environments our students frequent guide them toward accomplishing the college and career standards.

The applicant does not address how they will publicly share information on the quality of the investments made by this

grant.This section received a medium score as a result.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlines what strategies they will implement to facilitate ongoing communication. This will include an annual report from the superintendent, reports created by different stakeholder groups, quarterly stakeholder meetings to interpret data,etc. It is not clear how communication will differ between internal and external stakeholders or how these groups will be engaged and communicated with. As such the section received a medium score.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant partially met the criteria in this section and partial points were awarded.

Detailed narrative is provided in the three required areas: rationale, how the measure provides timely information and how the information will be reviewed and improved. Achievable performance measures are included though it was not clear how ambitious these were as targets were only provided for a few of the performance measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided examples of the different plan components it will be evaluating, such as the TeleHealth program and the 24/7 homework help. The applicant acknowledged the importance of evaluating effectiveness of the investments and provided some examples of how they intend to accomplish this, but a clear approach was not defined, only examples of possible components referred to. As such, this section received medium points.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget is heavily weighted in investments in staff and technology. For example, they will be funding a nurse, student patient data base creation, the D2D technology infrastructure, county wide wireless network, video conferencing technology, parent university coordinator, reading specialist, PD providers for staff PD, a project evaluator, stipends for staff to teach entrepreneurship and for consulting.

The budget narrative does not address how the applicant will ensure long-term sustainability of these investments and how these investments directly support personalized learning environments.

The applicant does include information on how they will leverage funding from other sources, I.E. the county wide wireless network.

The applicant does not distinguish clearly between one time investments versus ongoing operational costs. It would appear that most of the budget is financing one time investments and this leads to serious doubt on how sustainability of the plan will be achieved by the applicant. For these reasons, this section recieved a medium score.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This was not addressed in the applicants packet. No points are awarded in this section due to the lack of information requested.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**0**
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
This was not addressed by the applicant.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Not Met**
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant did not address sections A3, F2, of the Competitive Preference Priority of this grant application. As such, it cannot be assured from the provided information that the applicant has met with certainty the Absolute Priority 1.		

Total	**210**	**115**

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:		
No supplemental budgets were included in this application.		

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0849GA-2 for Ware County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's vision includes accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and increasing equity through personalized instruction. This will be accomplished through adopting a culture of innovation, adopting a culture of friendly technology, and enhancing the culture of developing the whole student. Through this three pronged approach the applicant believes that this will result in accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support. The vision builds on the four core educational assurance areas and guides the district towards the acceleration of student achievement.

The description of the district's vision demonstrates a comprehensive and coherent approach to reform.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

District leadership opted to implement the reforms district-wide so that everyone could benefit from the proposed program.

The applicant includes a list of schools that will participate in the grant activities.

The applicant lists the total number of participating students, number of participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and number of participating educators.

The information provided in the application provides significant detail about the approach to implementation. The detail provided supports the plan to implement the proposed program district-wide.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A logic model is included demonstrates to a minimal extent that the reforms proposed will be scaled up and how the activities will help the applicant reach outcome goals. The application describes lagging indicators and leading indicators. Variables used to measure each indicator are listed. The application does not adequately describe how the data to be collected will provide information about the listed indicators. This makes it difficult to determine the extent to which the proposed measures will demonstrate desired results.

The proposed program does not involve supporting district-wide change beyond the participating schools. Information is only provided about how indicators will be measured within the participating schools.

The information included in the application demonstrates to a moderate extent that the proposed elements will result in LEA-wide reform and change.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The application lists summative assessments that are administered in the district. The applicant provides baseline data as well as goals for student performance on the End-of-Course Tests and the Criterion Reference Competency Tests. The majority of the goals will not be above the baseline until the fourth year of the grant. Because many of the goals are set below the baseline, the annual goals, while likely achievable, cannot be considered ambitious. Two of the CRCT tests included in the list do not have baseline data, but goals are set for the four years of the proposed program. No explanation is provided for how the goals were set. Without baseline data it is not possible to determine if the annual goals are ambitious or achievable.

The applicant lists annual goals for decreasing the achievement gap for the overall student population as well as the identified subgroups. The annual goals listed are achievable, but are not ambitious. The post-grant goal for the overall population is lower than the baseline data provided in Reading and ELA. The post-grant goals for the subgroups do not bring student performance up to where the overall population scores are currently. It is not clear how this will result in decreasing the achievement gap. In addition, many of the subgroup goals are not higher than the baseline data until several years into the proposed program. The annual goals for decreasing achievement gaps are not ambitious.

Graduation rates and annual goals are provided for the overall population as well as identified subgroups. The annual goals increase each year and are achievable.

College enrollment rates are provided for the overall student population. The annual goals increase in number of students enrolling in college. The annual goals seem achievable. No explanation is provided as to why there is no increase in the number of student enrolling in college between the last year of funding and the first year post-grant.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides data indicating that in the past four years they have been able to raise student achievement. Scores on writing assessments have improved in 5th grade and in 8th grade. Reading and math scores on the CRCT improved for grades 3-8. Subgroups have shown improved performance in both student achievement and graduation rates. The applicant does not include college enrollment rates.

A table is included that shows the improvement in performance in the low achieving schools in the district.

Infinite Campus is used to make student performance data available to students and parents. However, no data is provided indicating how successful that has been. The applicant does not address how student performance data has been made available to educators in the past four years in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**5**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Budget data is listed at the end of each fiscal year on the Georgia Department of Education web portal. Salaries and travel expenditures for all employees are reported as well.

The school system posts monthly updates of financial information on the system website.

The information included in the application addresses the criteria for this section and demonstrates increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district works in cooperation with the Department of Education to obtain waivers when local needs and state requirements conflict. This demonstrates that the LEA has the successful conditions needed to implement the learning environments described in the proposal.

However, the applicant fails to address the element of sufficient autonomy.

This combination of factors results in a moderate level of evidence that the conditions necessary exist to implement the proposed learning environments.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	**10**	**6**

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A discussion was held about the pros and cons of applying for the grant among the schools principals, teachers, staff members, and the superintendent.

A survey was administered to principals, teachers, and staff to determine support for the grant.

The application does not describe how students or families were involved in the development of the proposal.

No details are provided about how the proposal was revised based on engagement and feedback from all stakeholders.

Letters of support from Australia's Academic and Research Network, Center for Puppetry Arts, The Children's Initiative, Ware County Commission, EKB Consulting Incorporated, the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, Georgia Southern University, Georgia Institute of Technology, the Mayor of Waycross, and the Okefenokee Regional Educational Services Agency are included in the appendices. Letters from parents and/or parent organizations are not included,

Because of the importance of parental involvement as a factor in student success, it presents some concern that parental input and support was not sought out in the development of the application or of the proposed project.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes a table which provides an outline of a plan. Activities, deliverables, and responsible parties are listed in the table.

The information presented is not a high-quality plan because it does not include specific, measurable goals; activities that correlate to goals; deliverables that relate to each of the activities; or assign an individual who is responsible for each of the deliverables.

More information is needed about the content of the reports and deliverables listed in the table in order to determine how well they provide information about the identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.

The application does not set specific, measurable goals correlated to the needs and gaps that will be addressed by the proposed program.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not describe any detailed strategies for helping students, with the support of parents and educators, understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. While the project will "help guide students toward College and Career Pathways that speak to their unique interests, talents, and goals", the applicant does not describe how student will set individual goals or how talents and interests will be ascertained.

The applicant states that the district "has in place strategies that ensure a personalized sequence of instructional content for every student and that set a clear path for graduation while increasing the college and career readiness of its students." However, the strategies are not described in adequate detail so as to determine the extent to which the strategies meet the criterion. It is not possible to determine how or if parents and educators are involved in the learning and development goals. No strategies are described for how students will understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals - following a prescribed pathway of interest does not help students structure their learning. No description is provided of strategies or techniques students will use to measure their progress toward their goals.

The applicant does not describe how students are assigned to College and Career Pathways.

No details are provided about how the Direct to Discovery project will be used to deepen learning experiences in areas of academic interest. No information is provided about how students will be able to select or pursue their particular area of interest.

The Direct to Discovery project will give students access and exposure to cultures, contexts, and perspectives that have the potential to motivate them. Examples suggested in the proposal include speaking with divers who are underwater in the Atlanta Aquarium and space content developed by NASA scientists and university astronomers. The applicant does not describe how watching these teleconferences will deepen individual student learning.

The proposed project includes Parent University which will be an avenue through which parents can become "better prepared to guide their children toward college and career decisions". Not enough details are included about Parent University to determine the extent to which this strategy will help the district achieve the criteria. No information is provided about: the location of Parent University, the operating hours, the specific material/content that will be taught/shared with parents, or who will staff Parent University.

The applicant states that the proposed program will help students master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving, but the applicant does not provide details about how this will be achieved.

The applicant does not provide adequate detail about the strategy that will be used to identify a personalized sequence of instruction for program participants. It is not possible to determine the extent to which the proposed program will be successful.

The applicant does not provide adequate detail about the instructional approaches and environments that will be used in order to determine the extent to which those approaches and environments are high quality.

The applicant does not provide information about how the digital content to be used in the proposed program aligns with college and career ready standards or graduation requirements. The rigor of the content is not addressed.

Students and their parents have access at any time to Infinite Campus, an online data system, which allows students and parents to view feedback in terms of progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards.

The applicant does not describe how students will receive ongoing and regular feedback regarding personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, and available content, instructional approaches, and supports.

The applicant does not include information about accommodations and high-quality strategies specifically targeted toward high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

The applicant states that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. However, the training mentioned in the proposal is for teachers. Parents will be offered opportunities for technical training at Parent University. Two additional Information Technology Specialists will be added to the technology staff, but insufficient information is included about their duties to determine the extent to which this will help the students understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them.

No differentiation in approach is described for high-need students.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that "collaboration, team work, discussion, project-based learning, audio, video, and the next new thing are the approaches and tools that will be successful." No additional details are provided to explain how these approaches and tools will be used to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. A high-quality plan is not presented. The application does not include specific, quantified objectives; goals correlated to the objectives; activities which support the goals; detailed timeline for implementation and integration of the activities; deliverables that will demonstrate results of the activities; or identification of the individuals responsible for the completion of activities and deliverables.

Insufficient information is provided to determine the extent to which the proposed program will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

Insufficient information is provided to determine the extent to which the proposed program will adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches.

Insufficient information is provided to determine the extent to which the proposed program will frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators.

Insufficient information is provided to determine the extent to which the proposed program will improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems, including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

Insufficient information is provided to determine the extent to which the proposed program will give all participating educators access to and knowledge about how to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. A high-quality plan is not included describing the ongoing training and professional development referenced in the application.

The application does not include specifics about how tools, data, and resources will be used to identify optimal learning approaches in response to individual student academic needs and interests. No strategies are identified. No resources or tools are identified.

Not enough detail is provided about the learning resources or digital resources is included to determine the rigor of the materials. It is not possible to evaluate the extent to which the materials are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

The application does not include specifics about how teachers will use tools to create and share new resources. it is not possible to evaluate the extent to which the proposed program will be successful in allowing teachers to create and share new resources as a means of accelerating student progress.

The application does not include sufficient information about process and tools that will be used to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in

meeting student needs. It is not possible to evaluate the extent to which the proposed project will be successful in accelerating student progress.

The district is developing a teacher evaluation system. No strategies are described about how that system will be used to help school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement. No timeline is provided for the development of the evaluation system.

The lack of specific information about the training, systems, and practices that will be used to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps makes it impossible to evaluate the extent to which the proposed program will be successful at helping school leaders meet individual; student academic needs and accelerate student progress.

The application does not include a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. No data is provided about current numbers of highly effective teachers. No measurable goals are set for increasing the number of highly effective teachers. No strategies are proposed for increasing the number of highly effective teachers.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not describe specific practices, policies, or rules that facilitate personalized learning by organizing the structure to provide support and services to all participating schools. An organizational chart was referenced in the body of the application, but was not actually included in the appendices as indicated. The administrative structure of the district, schools, and project were not explained in enough detail to evaluate the extent to which the proposed program would be successfully implemented.

The applicant describes some practice that provide school leadership teams with input into school schedules and calendars as well as personnel decisions and school level budgets. However, not enough information is provided to determine the extent to which these practices would help facilitate personalized learning.

An example is given of a student who earned a perfect score on a final exam without taking the class. The applicant applied for a waiver to allow the student to exempt the required class based on mastery. This student then had the opportunity to enroll in more advanced class. The applicant indicates that waivers such as this are received every year. The applicant does not address how this practice would impact the proposed program.

The applicant gives students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery through the administration of various assessments including state testing as well as CTAE Career Pathways testing and EOCT. This technically does give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times. However, all forms of assessments listed in the application are multiple choice examinations. The program as described does not allow students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery in multiple comparable ways.

The applicant does not describe how the proposed program will provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Information about how the learning resources and instructional practices that will be used in this program would be modified to be fully accessible to all students is not included as part of a high-quality plan to provide every student with the resources they need, when and where they are needed.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed program will include a one-to-one technology device component. By giving every student and certified staff member in the district their own technology device, the proposed project will help ensure that all participating students and educators have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. To ensure access outside of school, the applicant proposes providing high-speed internet access for each of the participating students. This component is not presented as part of a high-quality plan. The application does not include specific, quantified objectives; activities which support the goal of increased access; detailed timeline for implementation and integration of the activities;

deliverables that will demonstrate results of the activities; or identification of the individuals responsible for the completion of activities and deliverables.

The applicant provides a general overview of how the proposed project will ensure participants have needed technical support. Two information technologists will be hired to train and coach teachers and students. Parent University will teach parents how to use the technology tools. Both personal and online support will be available to teachers, students, and parents. However, these ideas are not fully developed as part of a high-quality plan for implementation. More detailed information is needed about each of the ideas in order to evaluate the extent to which this component of the project will be successful at ensuring everyone has the appropriate level of technical support.

The applicant does not address how the school infrastructure supports personalized learning by using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use data in other electronic learning systems.

The applicant does not sufficiently address how the school infrastructure supports personalized learning through the use of interoperable data systems. The applicant states that there is potential for applying interoperable data systems to enable various members of the learning team to look at multiple data points to make decisions about student needs. However, no specific strategies are described. No goals are set for this component. No activities planned to support the goals. No timeline is established for completion/implementation of the activities.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant lists questions that were developed from the creation of the Logic Model. Each question will be addressed through the collection of data from students, teachers, or administrators. Tables are included that present an outline of the information that would be a part of the continuous improvement process.

A high-quality plan is not presented for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. The application does not include specific, quantified objectives; goals correlated to the objectives; activities which clearly support the goals; deliverables that will demonstrate results of the activities; or identification of the individuals responsible for the completion of activities and deliverables that address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments.

While an outline of information is included about the proposed continuous improvement process, it only demonstrates to a moderate extent the degree to which the applicant will be able to collect and act upon timely and regular feedback.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has indicated that data will be reported on a schedule "that maximizes its use" and that "ongoing performance data will be delivered to stakeholders as soon as it can be analyzed and communicated." While these statements speak to the criterion, they provide no detail about strategies that will be implemented to achieve successful results.

Quarterly stakeholder meetings will be held to "interpret data from all perspectives and make recommendations based on these perspectives." Not enough information is provided to determine if this would be an effective strategy. The applicant does not identify who will be a part of these stakeholder meetings, where the stakeholder meetings will be held to ensure equitable access to all stakeholders, the qualifications of those interpreting the data, parties responsible for scheduling and running these meetings.

Well-developed, specific strategies are not presented so it is not possible to evaluate the extent to which the applicant will be successful in implementing ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Twelve performance measures were included in the application. For each of those measures, the applicant included a rationale and a description of the information obtained from that measure. The applicant explained how the measure could provide information relevant to the proposed program: student achievement, college- and career-readiness, and leadership effectiveness. Review and improvement of each of the performance measures is addressed as well.

Relevant performance measures were selected for each of the applicable populations.

No baseline or projection data was included for nine of the twelve performance measures. On the remaining three performance measures, the goals set were achievable, but not ambitious.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that the district plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the TeleHealth program, the 24/7 homework help initiative, video teleconferencing programs, professional development, and the Bring Your Own Technology project.

Specific strategies and/or activities for evaluating the effectiveness of activities are not described. It is not possible to determine the extent to which the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In the overall budget, the applicant lists funds from other sources used to fund the project. The applicant lists the source of these funds in the project-level budget narrative. The numbers listed at the project level are not the same as the numbers included in the overall budget and both of those are different from the number mentioned elsewhere in the application.

An overall budget narrative is not included.

All projects mentioned in the proposal are mentioned in the project-level budgets.

It is not conclusive that the budget is reasonable to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. The proposal does not account for increases in salary or fringe benefits for the duration of the grant.

The project-level budget about the TeleHealth Clinics raise a few concerns. The request is for funding 13 carts, but 15 supply packages. The applicant does not explain the need for seemingly extra packages. In addition, some of the sites already have carts, sufficient explanation is not provided as to why new carts are needed at those sites. The applicant mentions that these carts can also be used for "general teleconferencing and distance learning in classrooms throughout the district". The applicant does not explain how the carts will be used in the classroom as well as in the healthcare setting.

In the project-level budget narrative, the applicant introduces a project that was not addressed anywhere else in the proposal, Direct to Teaching. No objectives or targets are described for this project. Not enough information is included to determine how this project will be implemented as a part of the proposed program.

The budget requests funds for Generation Z Classrooms. The proposed project does not explain how these classrooms will effectively be used to improve teaching or student achievement or where these classrooms will be located. In addition, the applicant is requesting a classroom set of computer tablets for each of four Generation Z Classrooms. It is not clear why the classroom needs tablets if the school is implementing a one-to-one Bring Your Own Technology program.

For each proposed project the applicant identifies which funds are one-time investments versus those that are on-going.

The applicant does not address strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A high-quality plan is not presented. The application does not include specific, quantified objectives; goals correlated to the

objectives; activities which support the goals; detailed timeline for implementation and integration of the activities; deliverables that will demonstrate results of the activities; or identification of the individuals responsible for the completion of activities and deliverables.

Voters recently approved a one percent local sales tax which could provide some funding following the grant period. This indicates some level of sustainability.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**1**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant lists community organizations, but it is not indicated if these organizations are active partners with the school in relation to the proposed program. No specific information is provided that addresses the criteria for the Competitive Preference Priority.

Because the applicant does not provide sufficient detail about how the school will work with the organizations mentioned in the application to implement and/or sustain the proposed program, it is not possible to evaluate the the extent to which the applicant proposes to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Not Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; or increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	90

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0849GA-3 for Ware County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided evidence of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision centered on providing technology and access to all stakeholders in its area. It has demonstrated its commitment to educator evaluation systems, prepare students for college and careers, and will create a system to track students from high school to college. The nine components of its grant proposal will use technology to personalize learning, increase equity, increase student interest in academics, and deepen student learning through videoconferencing and other digital resources. Based on its success in the past, it has a credible approach to address the whole student and accelerate student achievement.

Because the applicant provides evidence that its vision is comprehensive and coherent, this criterion was marked high.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that includes all ten schools in the district, which serves 6086 students. The LEA provides a compelling rationale why all schools participate, as they see the value in the reforms for all ages and grades. Throughout the district, 4191 are low income and high need students. The ten schools have 318 educators total. The applicant meets the minimum requirements of the grant.

Because the LEA addressed completely each section of this criterion, it was judged high.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does include a logic model in the Appendix, showing inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact. This model supports a quality plan of reaching the outcome goals, with timelines, goals, targets, measurements, deliverables, and parties responsible as indicated in the Appendix and in section B5.

In this proposal, scale-up does not apply, as all of the LEA schools will participate in the project.

Because the applicant provides evidence of a high quality plan for reform to reach goals, this criterion was ranked high.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence that its goals are based on the State's targets, based on the GKIDS, GAA and CCRPI indicators.

Baseline district data is provided for the CRCT and EOCT, with achievable annual goals for the all student group and subgroups.

The applicant has created goals for decreasing achievement gaps, with supporting evidence such as professional development in intervention software such as Study Island and Education City. The LEA will also form progress monitoring teams to provide interventions based on individual need.

District targets for grades 3, 5, and 8 in reading, mathematics, and science is included in the Appendix, broken down by subgroup.

The LEA has provided evidence of baseline data and targets for overall college enrollment.

High School graduation rates are provided for all students and by subgroups.

The LEA does not provide assessment data by campus or data related to growth.

Because the LEA has provided some evidence that it will achieve these annual goals, but did not provide data by campus or assessment data related to growth, this criterion was judged medium.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA shows evidence for a clear track record of success in the past three years. The LEA provides narrative evidence that achievement scores have improved; for example, the 5th grade writing scored increased from 75% to 80% in three years. Data shows that gaps in graduation rates and achievement scores for African American students, low income students, and students with disabilities decreased. The applicant was able to improve to low performing schools so that they are out of corrective action and now considered High Progress.

The LEA has provided information to students so that student grades and progress can be accessed through the Internet. Provision is made for students without Internet access.

No evidence is given that student performance data is reported in such as way that it improves instruction and services to students and parents. Educators have access to SMART Response, which enables teachers to improve instruction and services to students. There is no information provided related to college enrollment. There are future plans to track students beyond high school.

The applicant does not provide evidence in formats such as raw student data, charts, or graphs.

 Because the applicant has had a clear track record of success, this criterion is rated high.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA provides evidence that its school level expenditures are placed on the department of education website, by school, program, and fund source. Included also are salaries and benefits data.

Because of the evidence that the LEA provides concerning financial transparency, this criterion is ranked high.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that it could have autonomy from state requirements by obtaining waivers. The LEA has also been an early adopter of policies later required by the state. For example, it was a pioneer in the implementation of the state's Student Achievement Pyramid of Interventions. This demonstrates that some favorable conditions are present for the proposal to succeed.

However, the proposal relates to distance learning, use of personal technology, and teleconferencing. No evidence is given that the LEA will have autonomy from state regulatory or statutory requirements related to student use of technology.

Because favorable conditions exist in general, but no evidence is given for autonomy from regulations related specifically to technology, this criterion was ranked medium.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that the district staff was involved in the proposal by using surveys. More than 260 responded favorably. The Board of Education voted in favor of the proposal as well.

Letters of support form community partners, local officials, international organizations, and institutions of higher education are included.

No evidence is given for community, parent or student involvement in the proposal or its revision. No letters of support form student or parent organizations are included.

Because the LEA included staff input, a diverse group of support as evidenced by letters, but did not include parent or student input, this criterion was judged medium.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA includes a logic plan in the Appendix, and includes a table indicating with measures, frequency of measurement, deliverables, and party responsible. For example, graduation rates are measured annually and will be published in an annual impact report and formally presented by the district superintendent. a personalized learning report will be produced each semester based on weekly classroom observations.

Because the applicant presents a high quality plan that addresses personalized learning environments, needs analysis and the logic behind the proposal, this criterion was marked high.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that students will be involved in deep learning through video teleconferencing, and online learning. This technology will also expose students to diverse contexts and perspectives.

The LEA notes that parents are supported through the Parent University, 24/7 homework help, and Teachers as Advisors programs. Support will also be provided to students in the use of online tools to track progress. The applicant lists several potential activities to support parents and students, but without sufficient details to weight the merits of the activities.

The applicant shows evidence that students will receive feedback regarding their college and careers readiness through the district's student information software. Other district resources such as Thinkgate and AutoSkill will create a personalized sequence of instructional content. In addition, the LEA will use Response to Intervention to accommodate high need students.

The applicant does not provide specific evidence how the project will foster skills and traits such as critical thinking and creativity or how student learning will be overtly connected to student goals. It is not clear how teachers will link strategies to personalize instruction.

As the applicant has clearly addressed some of the components of this section, but lacks specificity in others (how students will develop desired traits, details of parental support, how teachers will convert strategies to personalization), this criterion is ranked medium.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that all district educators participate in professional development related to technology-based strategies for personalizing learning environments. Teachers and principals use data to frequently measure student progress, and technology is used to create supports, recommendations and interventions for students. Staff have been trained to use the tools and resources. Evidence of professional development includes the Direct to Teaching program that provides training to teachers.

The applicant does not provide evidence that a teacher evaluation system is used to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness. No evidence is given for an existing plan to increase the number of students who will receive instruction from highly effective educators.

Because the LEA provides evidence that its educators are trained in technology, but no evidence that practice is informed by its evaluation system nor that a plan is in place for increasing students who are served by effective teachers, this criterion is ranked medium.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided evidence that its schools are given autonomy from the district's guidelines. Teacher groups have influence over scheduling and input on budgets. No evidence is given that the central office is organized to maximize supports to the schools.

The LEA provides evidence that student progress is based on mastery as demonstrated by waivers on seat time and test by exams filed with the State department of education. Limited evidence is provided that students can demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple ways.

The district provides evidence that its practices are accessible to students with disabilities, as it has changed its pull out program to an inclusion program. No evidence is given that learning resources are fully accessible to English Language Learners.

Because the applicant provides some evidence that the LEA policies and practices facilitate learning, this criterion is rated medium.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA provides evidence that technology will be used to ensure that all stakeholders will have access to learning resources, both in and out of school. The proposal includes providing Internet access to all students by building a county-wide wireless network, as well as a Bring Your Own Technology plan so that each student has a device that can access the Internet. The LEA will provide technical support through technology specialists, who will be accessible to students, parents, and staff members.

The district has several systems that interoperable, including human resources and finance. It further plans to apply interoperable data systems as part of the Response to Intervention model.

The applicant provides evidence in its budget section that building a 900 square mile county-wide wireless network is part of a high quality plan.

The applicant does not provide evidence that its student and parent portal allows users to export data in an open format.

Because the district has presented evidence for its commitment to technology, but does not include evidence that users can export data in an open format, this criterion was ranked medium.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that it has many activities needed for a high-quality strategy for continuous improvement. It will use grant funds to create a Continuous Improvement Center, and it has including a logic model with areas to monitor, such as student engagement, increased educator effectiveness, with lagging and leading indicators, measures, timelines, and responsible parties. Reports will be developed with stakeholder input so that they will be useful for all groups. The LEA will

hold quarterly meetings with stakeholders.   However, no goals for continuous improvement are given that correlate to the continuous improvement activities.

 Evidence is given that the continuous improvement plan will monitor the investments in technology beyond usage, including the Bring Your Own Technology plan.

Because the applicant has given some elements of a high quality plan for continuous improvement, this criterion was marked medium.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has provided evidence that it will communicate the findings of its Continuous Improvement Center in various ways, with internal and external stakeholders. The superintendent will address this topic in an annual meeting, there will be quarterly stakeholder meetings to issue updates, and electronic reports will be designed with input from all stakeholders. These reports will be online so that all groups can access them at any time.

However, the applicant does not clearly describe how it will gather and utilize feedback to improve the plan.

Because the LEA does not clearly describe how feedback will be used to improve the plan, but provides evidence for multiple strategies of communication, this area is marked high.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA presents evidence that it has achievable performance objectives and annual targets for a range of student groups on age appropriate measures. It also includes performance measures of teachers and educational leaders. For first to eighth grades, it will use the CRCT to measure academic achievement. Younger students will participate in a student engagement survey, while older students will take a survey of health. High School students will take end of course achievement tests and the Perkins indicator for career readiness. However, baseline information is missing for several of the performance measures. Its performance objectives are not ambitious, with several (e.g. student climate) that only increase by one percent per year.

The LEA includes its rationale for the measures as well as how they related to the area of concern. Its Continuous Improvement Center will monitor and review these measures.

Because the LEA provides evidence that it has achievable, but not ambitious performance objectives, this criterion was ranked medium.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA provides evidence that it will review its professional development process through its Continuous Improvement Center. It includes plans to evaluate several aspects of its use of technology, such as its 24/7 homework help initiative, its teleconferencing program, and the Bring Your Own Technology initiative. Teams of teachers will meet regularly to evaluate these aspects.

The LEA does not provide evidence of a coherent mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of investments. It is not clear if the team of teachers evaluating the technology plan will work with the Continuous Improvement Center. Reporting timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not indicated.

Because the LEA provides some evidence to evaluate the project, but does not have a coherent evaluative and reporting mechanism, this area was judged medium.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA identifies nine projects: the expansion of TeleHealth, Direct to Discovery, Direct from the Wild, Bring Your Own Technology, Access EveryWare, Direct to Teaching, Generation Z, Ware Student Succeed, the Entrepreneurship initiative.

All of the initiatives except the Access EveryWare are funded solely from the Race to the Top District grant monies. Access EveryWare will be funded through a local tax, which has already been approved by voters.

The LEA provides evidence that the projects are reasonable and sufficient to implement the proposal. The applicant does not supply a clear link between performance measures and the TeleHealth and Entrepreneurship initiatives.

The Bring Your Own Device plan is reasonable due to the local commitment for the Access EveryWare initiative. Evidence for sustainability for these two plans is given in the narrative, including the on-going tax for technology support.

Because the applicant has provided evidence that its budget is reasonable and sufficient, this area is marked high.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA provides evidence for sustainability of its plan in Budget Subpart 4, showing that voters have approved an Education Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax that will provide funds for the technology plan for the next five years. This tax has been renewed in the past.

The applicant does not provide evidence of support in the form of letters from local leaders.

No evidence is given for the sustainability of funds for the reading specialists or other personnel in the General Ware Students Succeed plan.

Because the LEA has provided evidence for the sustainability of its technology infrastructure, but not its personnel costs, this area was scored medium.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**0**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority, and thus no points were awarded.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Not Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has presented evidence that it coherently and comprehensively address the core areas. However, it does not comprehensively explain how it will build on them with sufficient details beyond listing strategies.

Its nine components focus on the use of technology to enhance professional development of teachers, but the link between strategies and the outcome of personalization of learning for students is not provided in sufficient detail. Its goals related to student achievement, graduation rates, and decreasing achievement gaps are achievable, but are not ambitious..

Because of the evidence presented by the applicant only address some of this criterion, absolute priority one has not been met.

Total	210	137